

## Comments on Planning Application 2017/1465/P – Guinness Court, London NW8 7QE

These comments relate to planning application reference 2017/1465/P, which is described by Camden as relating to “Guinness Court, London NW8 7QE” but in fact that address has not existed for several years. For more than three years, the site has been called “Regents Gate, Cecil Grove, London NW8 7EB”. The use of an old name may have confused readers of the notices which Camden have placed in the locality advertising this planning application. Camden may wish to re-advertise it with the correct address.

We live at 27 St. Edmund’s Terrace, the rear of which looks out onto the site concerned. The proposed front door of the current vacant refuse store (proposed to be the front door of the new flat) faces our ground floor windows, which are only a few metres away. We have first and second floor windows which overlook the “green roof” of the current vacant refuse store (the subject of the application) and the central courtyard of the Cecil Grove development.

Subject to the very serious concerns noted below about the specific proposals in the application, we approve in principle of the idea of converting a vacant refuse store into a flat. It avoids this area becoming a neglected corner of Cecil Grove. Occupation should provide a degree of natural surveillance.

Our concerns relate to **landscaping** and the **outlook** from our property, and we ask Camden to require the applicant to submit proposals to address them.

The site history is relevant to understanding our concerns. Regents Gate/Cecil Grove was built over the past five years on the site of a now-demolished property called Guinness Court. The Guinness Court site included extensive gardens with many mature trees. Particular attention was paid by Camden in the planning process for the redevelopment to landscaping and replanting. See planning reference 2010/4850/P, in particular sections 6.14 and 6.15 of the Officer Committee Report dated 3 September 2009. So, for example, there was to be a green roof on what is now the vacant refuse store, there were to be flowerbeds alongside that refuse store, and there were to be trees in and around the central carpark and courtyard area, all specified on the landscaping plans.

We were closely involved with the plans for the redevelopment and met with representatives of the developer (Guinness Developments) and their contractors (Galliford Try) on many occasions as the landscaping plans were progressed. We were shown the artist’s impression of the view from the ground floor windows of our house which is attached as page 3. Also attached (page 4) is the developer’s tree plan, showing removed trees in orange, retained trees in light green and new trees in dark green. Those documents are also on Camden’s website, filed under reference 2010/4850/P.

On the tree plan (page 4), we have added a red “X” to mark our house, and a blue “X” to mark the unused refuse store which is the subject of the current planning application. Please note in particular the large number of orange (i.e. removed) trees in that area, and that the replacement (dark green) trees are focussed in a planter comprising some six trees about 20 metres away from our house, plus four trees in the parking area of the courtyard.

The development was completed in 2015, so far as we can see according to the plans. However, two of the four trees in the parking area of the courtyard have not taken well and are not flourishing. The green roof of the unused refuse store has never been very green.

In June 2016, we were notified by Camden of a planning application by the new owner of the site (Marcus Cooper) to install a new refuse store facility in the centre of the courtyard, replacing the planter of six trees just mentioned. We had not been forewarned. The application number was 2016/2974/P. In view of the above history, we were very concerned by the proposed landscaping changes. We set out our concerns via comments to Camden's planning department. They were published on Camden's website. A copy is attached on page 5. You will see that we expressed concerns about loss of trees and changes in outlook and noted that the plans submitted as showing the existing layout did not in fact do so. We also noted that the applicant was silent about future use of the unused refuse store. We expected to hear further from either Camden or from the site owner but we heard from neither.

By January 2017, we realised that Camden must have considered our comments but there was no information on the planning website about the progress of application 2016/2974/P. We therefore emailed the planning department at Camden to ask what was happening. A copy of our email is on page 6. We did not receive a response.

Earlier this month (April 2017), we read about the planning application for conversion of the unused Cecil Grove refuse store into a flat, on which we are now commenting (application 2017/1465/P). When we read the associated documents submitted by the applicant on Camden's website, these suggested that application 2016/2974/P for a new refuse store had been granted, but there is still no evidence of that decision or the reasons for it on Camden's website. We have included a printout on page 7 which shows the relevant page on Camden's website. No "decision" document appears there.

We sincerely hope that our comments were taken into account when Camden decided application 2016/2974/P, if indeed Camden has decided it.

Those previous comments are directly relevant to the present application (ref. 2017/1465/P), because the new application could further prejudice our outlook and further reduce the quality of the landscaping. In particular:

1. Nothing is being done to offset the loss of the six or so trees where the new refuse store would be.
2. The "green roof" of the unused refuse store (the new flat) – which has never been very green – is to be reduced in size.
3. It would appear that the terrace of the new flat would reduce the size of the existing flowerbed.

We therefore ask Camden to:

1. Require the applicant to produce some improved green landscaping plans before Camden approves the new planning application (ref. 2017/1465/P).
2. Explain to us how our comments on the previous planning application (ref. 2016/2974/P) were taken into account.

The residents of 27 St. Edmund's Terrace

22 April 2017

Enc.

**The Guinness Trust**  
St Edmund's Terrace, NW8 7QE

Artist impression



View of the central courtyard (from northern boundary)



DO NOT SCALE DIMENSIONS OFF THIS DRAWING  
 CHECK ALL DIMENSIONS ON THE SITE BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION  
 VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS ON THE GROUND TO VERIFY ACCURACY  
 THIS DRAWING IS PROTECTED UNDER COPYRIGHT AND  
 SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED IN PART OR WHOLE WITHOUT  
 THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF SPRINT LIMITED

**KEY**

- Existing trees to be retained and protected refer to tree report
- Existing trees to be removed refer to tree report
- Proposed trees Extra heavy standard refer to design statement
- Proposed pleached trees on frame refer to design statement

**TREE SUMMARY**

Existing trees retained within site boundary	19no.
Existing trees removed	31no. (4no. category B, 23no. category C, 4no. Category R)
Proposed new trees	23no.
Proposed pleached trees	35no.

REV	BY	DATE	CHK	DESCRIPTION

STATUS: For Planning

CONTRACTOR:

PROJECT: St Edmunds Terrace NW8 7QE

CLIENT: THE GUINNESS TRUST

DRAWING TITLE: Tree Plan

DATE CREATED: 25.08.10	SCALE: 1:200 @ A2
DRAWING APPROVED BY: NUJAL	CHECKED: JK
DRAWING NO & REVISION: 12308_02_901-D0	

**sprint.**

SPRINT The Quadrangle, 2nd Floor, 188 Wardour Street, London W1F 8PY  
 T +44 (0)20 7287 1153 F +44 (0)20 7287 3675 www.sprint.co.uk

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2974/P	27 St. Edmund's Terrace	27 St. Edmund's Terrace London NW8 7QB	26/06/2016 21:41:28	COMMENT	<p>We live at 27 St. Edmund's Terrace. Our windows overlook the Regent's Gate site. We were involved from 2009 in discussions with the developers of the site (then Guinness Developments), in particular regarding the bin store arrangements.</p> <p>We support the concerns about the spread of litter and vermin under the current arrangements. It is clearly unsatisfactory, and a health and safety concern, to leave rubbish unattended and unenclosed in a courtyard.</p> <p>The part of the proposal relating to a new bin store at the front of Searle House is acceptable to us. However, we are unhappy about the following aspects of the remainder of the planning application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No information is provided about the proposed use for the existing "central bin store", which in fact has never been used.</li><li>2. The plans which are supposed to show the existing layout of the landscaped gardens are not accurate. They do not correspond with what has in fact been built, making it difficult to understand what is proposed.</li><li>3. It appears that the proposed new bin store in the centre of the courtyard would replace at least a large planter containing 5 trees (and other plants) and possibly some of a lawn. When the development was started, 22 large trees were removed from the site and we understand that the developer promised Camden that they would be replaced. It would seem that now 5 of the new trees are to be lost. The proposal diminishes the current aesthetic landscaping and related environmental benefits.</li><li>4. We would like to see a proper artist's impression of the proposed landscaping viewed from our house. Our outlook could be compromised by an unsightly structure.</li></ol>

---

---

**Subject:** Re: Comments on 2016/2974/P have been received by the council.

---

**From:** mbr@talk21.com (mbr@talk21.com)

---

**To:** planning@camden.gov.uk;

---

**Date:** Sunday, 15 January 2017, 15:58

---

Further to our comments of last June copied below, please could you let us know what is happening with this planning application?

With thanks in advance.

---

**From:** "planning@camden.gov.uk" <planning@camden.gov.uk>

**To:** mbr@talk21.com

**Sent:** Sunday, 26 June 2016, 21:41

**Subject:** Comments on 2016/2974/P have been received by the council.

We live at 27 St. Edmund's Terrace. Our windows overlook the Regent's Gate site. We were involved from 2009 in discussions with the developers of the site (then Guinness Developments), in particular regarding the bin store arrangements.

We support the concerns about the spread of litter and vermin under the current arrangements. It is clearly unsatisfactory, and a health and safety concern, to leave rubbish unattended and unenclosed in a courtyard.

The part of the proposal relating to a new bin store at the front of Searle House is acceptable to us. However, we are unhappy about the following aspects of the remainder of the planning application:

1. No information is provided about the proposed use for the existing "central bin store", which in fact has never been used.
2. The plans which are supposed to show the existing layout of the landscaped gardens are not accurate. They do not correspond with what has in fact been built, making it difficult to understand what is proposed.
3. It appears that the proposed new bin store in the centre of the courtyard would replace at least a large planter containing 5 trees (and other plants) and possibly some of a lawn. When the development was started, 22 large trees were removed from the site and we understand that the developer promised Camden that they would be replaced. It would seem that now 5 of the new trees are to be lost. The proposal diminishes the current aesthetic landscaping and related environmental benefits.
4. We would like to see a proper artist's impression of the proposed landscaping viewed from our house. Our outlook could be compromised by an unsightly structure.

## Related Documents

### Summary

**Application No:** 2016/2974/P

**Records:** 10

### Application Documents

The links below are to PDF files. To view PDFs you need to download and install [Adobe Acrobat Reader](#) onto your computer. **Help for people with visual disabilities:** The files contained scanned documents that cannot be read by screen readers. If this is a problem for you please use the [Planning online support form](#) to request an alternative format.

Drawings can be large files. The quality of the image depends on the quality of the original submission.

Date Created	Title	Document Type
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Application Form (No Personal Data)</a>	Application Form
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Planning Statement</a>	M3 Document
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Existing Refuse Strategy Plan</a>	M3 Document
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Proposed Refuse Strategy Plan</a>	M3 Document
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Block B Proposed Refuse/Recycling Store</a>	M3 Document
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Block A Proposed Refuse/Recycling Store</a>	M3 Document
26/05/2016 10:31	<a href="#">Location Plan</a>	M3 Document
20/06/2016 15:42	<a href="#">1 x Response (Redacted)</a>	Consultation Response
24/06/2016 10:18	<a href="#">1 x Comment</a>	Consultation Response
27/06/2016 12:18	<a href="#">1 x Comment 2974</a>	Consultation Response